DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL



MECHIVED

SEP 30 1773

September 28, 1993

red-IME REGIA

Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20554

RE: Comments of Summit Communications, Inc., concerning the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 92-266, released August 27, 1993.

Enclosed are an original and nine copies of our comments regarding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking described above.

If you should have any questions about the enclosed, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

Robert J. Erickson Senior Vice President

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20554

SEP 30 1993

In the Matter of

roc-imilianoom

Implementation of Sections of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992

MM Docket 92-266

Rate Regulation

To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF SUMMIT COMMUNICATIONS, INC., CONCERNING THE THIRD NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING RELEASED AUGUST 27, 1993

Date:

September 28, 1993

James A. Hirshfield President

Robert J. Erickson Senior Vice President

Summit Communications, Inc. 3633 136th Pl. SE, Suite 107 Bellevue, WA 98006 (206) 747-4600

COMMENTS

- Section 141 discusses pass-through of programming costs on 1. an ongoing basis. Unfortunately, it assumes the cable system is already regulated and price-capped. Commission should also make its methodology available to systems which have not yet been regulated. That is, systems adding or deleting channels should be allowed to adjust benchmarks as if this rule were in effect, and include such adjustments in their initial Form 393 filing. Otherwise, if a franchising authority has not certified, the cable system is financially motivated to add inexpensive satellite channels in order to improve a potential future benchmark showing, at acceptable cost. Instead, the operator will not add an expensive satellite channel, as the cable system may be subsequently certified, and the operator would have no way of recovering such costs.
- 2. Cost of upgrades required by local franchising authorities (Sections 153, 154). External treatment should be allowed for increased franchise costs, including upgrades. This has the benefit of surfacing these costs and making them a visible part of franchise discussions. It would tie franchise requirements for increased costs to the economic return expected from such costs, and maintain consistency with the Commission's benchmark tables.
- 3. Regarding alternative methods of handling upgrade costs, if the external treatment suggested in section 153 is not adopted for all systems, it should be adopted for systems under 5,000 customers. Our premise is that cost of service showings for smaller systems will generate a higher regulatory cost per customer than is reasonable.
- 4. We do not believe that local franchise authorities should determine the way in which rates are adjusted to reflect increased costs. Smaller municipalities lack the expertise to do this. All municipalities would have to contend with a conflict of interest between the political desire for lower rates and the constitutional requirement to allow a fair return to the cable company. We believe that this conflict of interest would result in many such local determinations being appealed to the Commission. However, we believe that a methodology to adjust rates for such upgrades which both the franchise authority and the cable operator support would be an acceptable (and administratively simple) alternative for recovering required upgrade costs, and should be allowed.
- 5. The amortization of the cost of system upgrades is of particular concern to small cable operators, who often encounter franchise demands

for a plethora of investments which might be sustainable in large cities, but make no economic sense in small markets.

Respectfully submitted,

Summit Communications, Inc.

Tamba A Hirahfield

President

By: Kokert Houckson

Robert J. Grickson CPA

3633 136th Pl., SE Suite 107

Bellevue, WA 98006

(206) 747-4600